

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-23, 25-34, 36-44 and 46-78 are pending in the application. Claims 51-78 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed toward non-elected inventions. In the Final Office Action of February 25, 2004, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-12, 14, 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishizaki et al.*
- B.) Rejected claims 8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishizaki et al.* in view of *Thompson et al.*
- C.) Rejected claims 19-23, 25, 26, 29-34, 36, 37, 40-44, 46, 47 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishizaki et al.* in view of *Ikeda*.
- D.) Rejected claims 28, 39 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishizaki et al.* in view of *Ikeda* and further in view of *Thompson et al.*
- E.) Rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamano et al.*
- F.) Rejected claims 8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamano et al.* in view of *Thompson et al.*
- G.) Rejected claims 19-27, 30-38 and 41-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamano et al.* in view of *Ikeda*.
- H.) Rejected claims 28, 39 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamano et al.* in view of *Ikeda* and further in view of *Thompson et al.*

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and address the Examiner's disposition as follows:

- A.) Rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-12, 14, 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishizaki et al.*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 10 have each been amended to each claim an anode that contains a metal belonging to the group V or group VI of the periodic table at least at a portion of the anode that is in contact with an organic light emission layer. The metal includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum. The anode has a reflectance of 40% or higher. As described in Applicants' specification, since the anode has a reflectance of 40% or higher, and the anode is used with the cathode, which may be more light permeable, light can be emitted via the cathode. (Specification, page 12, lines 14-20).

This is clearly unlike *Nishizaki*, which fails to disclose or even suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. *Nishizaki* fails to disclose or suggest the anode materials niobium, tantalum or molybdenum. *Nishizaki* discloses an anode made of chromium, however, *Nishizaki* fails to disclose or suggest that its chromium anode has a reflectance of 40% or higher. Instead, *Nishizaki* discloses that its anode that has a transmissivity of 10% or more. (Col. 53, lines 49-54). In other words, *Nishizaki* merely teaches that its anode has a certain transmissivity, but fails to even discuss its anode's reflectance. Thus, *Nishizaki* teaches a means to pass light through its chromium anode by providing an anode with a transmissivity of 10% or more. This clearly teaches away from Applicants' claimed anode that has a reflectance of 40% or higher, which provides improved reflectivity to purposefully reflect light away from the anode instead of purposefully passing the light through the anode.

Further, Applicants agree that certain anode materials may have *some* reflectance value, however, it is not inherent that *Nishizaki's* chromium anode has Applicants' *claimed* reflectance. As discussed above, *Nishizaki* teaches purposefully passing light through its chromium anode. Thus, *Nishizaki's* chromium anode has a reduced reflectance, so that *Nishizaki* can achieve its transmissivity of 10% or more.

As discussed in Applicants' specification, when Applicants' claimed anode, which has a reflectance of 40% or higher, is used with the cathode, which may be more light permeable, an improved light amount can be emitted via the cathode. (Specification, page 12, lines 14-20).

Nowhere does *Nishizaki* even discuss its chromium anode's reflectance -- and to the contrary merely discusses its chromium anode's transmissivity. Accordingly, *Nishizaki* fails to disclose or even suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher.

Therefore, *Nishizaki* fails to disclose or even suggest Applicants' claim 1 and 10.

Claims 3, 5-6, 9, 12, 14-15 and 18 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 10 are allowable.

Claims 2 and 11 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B.) Rejection of claims 8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishizaki et al.* in view of *Thompson et al.*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable over *Nishizaki* as discussed above. *Thompson* still fails to disclose or suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. Therefore, *Nishizaki* in view of *Thompson* still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claims 1 and 10.

Claims 8 and 17 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 10 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejection of claims 19-23, 25, 26, 29-34, 36, 37, 40-44, 46, 47 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishizaki et al.* in view of *Ikeda*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 19, 30 and 41 have each been amended to each claim an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. As described in Applicants' specification, the claimed anode has a work function that allows it to effectively supply holes, as well as having reduced defects compared to known conventional anodes made with conventional materials. (Specification, page 10, lines 2-12).

As described above with respect to claims 1 and 10, this is clearly unlike *Nishizaki*, which fails to disclose or even suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. Therefore, claims 19, 30 and 41 are also allowable over *Nishizaki*, since *Nishizaki* fails to disclose or suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher.

Further, *Ikeda* also fails to disclose or suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. Therefore, *Nishizaki* in view of *Ikeda* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 19, 30 and 41.

Claims 20-21, 23, 25-26, 29, 31-32, 34, 36-37, 40, 42, 44, 46-47 and 50 depend directly or indirectly from claims 19, 30 or 41 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 19, 30 and 41 are allowable.

Claims 22, 33 and 43 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

D.) Rejection of claims 28, 39 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishizaki et al.* in view of *Ikeda* and further in view of *Thompson et al.*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 19, 30 and 41 are allowable over *Nishizaki* in view of *Ikeda* as discussed above. *Thompson* still fails to disclose or suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. Therefore, *Nishizaki* in view of *Ikeda* and further in view of *Thompson* still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claims 19, 30 and 41.

Claims 28, 39 and 49 depend directly or indirectly from claims 19, 30 or 41 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 19, 30 and 41 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

E.) Rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamano et al.*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 10 have each been amended to each claim an anode that contains a metal belonging to the group V or group VI of the periodic table at least at a portion of the anode that is in contact with an organic light emission layer. The metal includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum. The anode has a reflectance of 40% or higher. As described in Applicants' specification, since the anode has a reflectance of 40% or higher, and the anode is used with the cathode, which may be more light permeable, light can be emitted via the cathode. (Specification, page 12, lines 14-20).

This is clearly unlike *Tamano*, which fails to disclose or even suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. *Tamano* discloses an anode made of carbon, aluminum, vanadium, iron, cobalt, nickel, tungsten, silver, gold, platinum, or palladium. However, *Tamano* fails to disclose or suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher.

Applicants also note that certain anode materials may have *some* reflectance value, however, it is not inherent those anodes have Applicants' *claimed* reflectance.

Therefore, *Tamano* fails to disclose or even suggest Applicants' claim 1 and 10.

Claims 3, 5-6, 9, 12, 14-15 and 18 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 10 are allowable.

Claims 2 and 11 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

F.) Rejection of claims 8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamano et al.* in view of *Thompson et al.*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable over *Tamano* as discussed above. *Thompson* still fails to disclose or suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. Therefore, *Tamano* in view of *Thompson* still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claims 1 and 10.

Claims 8 and 17 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 10 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

G.) Rejection of claims 19-27, 30-38 and 41-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamano et al.* in view of *Ikeda*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 19, 30 and 41 have each been amended to each claim an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. As described in Applicants' specification, the claimed anode has a work function that allows it to effectively supply holes, as well as having reduced defects compared to known conventional anodes made with conventional materials. (Specification, page 10, lines 2-12).

As described above with respect to claims 1 and 10, this is clearly unlike *Tamano*, which fails to disclose or even suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. Therefore, claims 19, 30

and 41 are also allowable over *Tamano*, since *Tamano* fails to disclose or suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium and chromium that has a reflectance of 40% or higher.

Further, *Ikeda* also fails to disclose or suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. Therefore, *Tamano* in view of *Ikeda* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 19, 30 and 41.

Claims 20-21, 23, 25-26, 29, 31-32, 34, 36-37, 40, 42, 44, 46-47 and 50 depend directly or indirectly from claims 19, 30 or 41 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 19, 30 and 41 are allowable.

Claims 22, 33 and 43 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

H.) Rejection of claims 28, 39 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamano et al.* in view of *Ikeda* and further in view of *Thompson et al.*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 19, 30 and 41 are allowable over *Tamano* in view of *Ikeda* as discussed above. *Thompson* still fails to disclose or suggest an anode that includes at least one of niobium, tantalum, chromium, and molybdenum that has a reflectance of 40% or higher. Therefore, *Tamano* in view of *Ikeda* and further in view of *Thompson* still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claims 19, 30 and 41.

Claims 28, 39 and 49 depend directly or indirectly from claims 19, 30 or 41 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 19, 30 and 41 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12, 14-21, 23, 25-32, 34, 36-42, 44, and 46-50 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris P. Rauch (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHNEIN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 24, 2004.

Christopher P. Rauch (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch